THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI

and

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 26507 of 1998

Dated: 23.07.2005

Between:

M. Ramireddy, S/o. Govinda Reddy, Government College of Physical Education, Hyderabad, R/o. 63, M.I.G. Housing Board, Kurnool Dist.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Government of A.P., Rep. by its Secretary, Education Department, (Ser.I), Secretariat, Buildings, Hyderabad and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T.MEENA KUMARI

and

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 26507 of 1998

-

-

ORDER: (Per the Hon'ble Smt Justice T.Meena Kumari)

Questioning the order dated 18.08.1998 in O.A.No.6427 of 1997 passed by the 4th respondent, the present writ petition is filed by the petitioner.

02. The relevant facts for determination of this controversy are that the petitioner worked as Inspector of Physical Education, Hyderabad and retired on 30.06.1990. The 3rd respondent was appointed as Enquiry Officer vide proceedings dated 20.06.1991 in G.O.Rt.No.1338 to enquire into certain charges leveled against the petitioner. Basing on the report of the 3rd respondent, the 1st respondent issued a show cause notice dated 17.04.1995, for which, the petitioner submitted his explanation. Without considering the same, the 1st respondent imposed a provisional punishment of 5% cut in monthly pension of the petitioner for a period of one year vide G.O.Rt.No.1232, Education, dated 19.08.1997. Challenging the same, he filed O.A.No.6427 of 1997 before the Tribunal and the same was dismissed. Aggrieved thereby, the present writ petition has been preferred.

03. Heard the learned counsel on either side.

04. Contextual fact depicts that after affording an opportunity of giving explanation to the petitioner, the 1st respondent has passed the order impugned. The Tribunal having gone through the entire material on record and

the enquiry report, passed the order impugned by holding that the respondents have conducted the enquiry in accordance with the rules.

05. Taking conspectus of the aforesaid facts and circumstances and in view of the fact that the punishment suffered by the petitioner for a period of one year is already over, we do not find that any manifest injustice is caused to the petitioner warranting interference of this Court.

06. As a result, this writ petition merits dismissal, and is accordingly dismissed.

_____

T.MEENA KUMARI, J

_____

P.LAKSHMANA REDDY, J

Dated: 23.09.2005

rkk